

REMARKS

The information disclosure statement (“IDS”) filed on August 13, 2004 and November 13, 2006 is objected to for failing to provide a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,748,980 to Lipe et al. (hereinafter “Lipe”).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 25, 2007. A proposed amendment was discussed. Examiner indicated that the amendment would overcome Lipe if supported by the specification.

Response to the objection to the IDS.

The IDS filed on August 13, 2004 and the IDS filed on November 13, 2006 are objected to for failing to provide a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. In response to the telephone discussion of January 22, 2007, Applicants have included English Abstracts of the Japanese patents cited in the IDS, along with an IDS providing a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed. Applicants submit that the Abstracts and summaries satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3).

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lipe. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 to include the limitations “...disabling all of the plurality of communication adapters ...” and “...wherein other communication adapters remain disabled...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 as amended. The amendments are well supported by the specification, which discloses disabling all communication adapters. Page 25, lines 1-7, page 19, lines 12-13, page 17, lines 11-14, fig. 7, ref. s141, original claims 2, 8, 12, and 20.

Lipe discloses disabling devices that do not require default-type configuration during power up. Lipe, col. 20, lines 41-42; fig. 4A, ref. 56. After power up, the devices are enabled. Lipe, col. 22, lines 7-8; fig. 4C, ref. 76. The amendment clarifies that in the present invention, all communication devices are disabled and one specified communication device is enabled. The other communication devices remain disabled. Applicants therefore submit that as amended, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 are allowable as Lipe does not teach that all communication adapters are disabled and only the selected adapter enabled.

Claims 2, 8, 12, and 20 are canceled. Applicants have not specifically traversed the rejections of dependent claims 5, 9, 12, 13, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, but believe those claims to be allowable for depending from allowable claims.

Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 5, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929